

S.7M



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/491,639	01/27/2000	Timothy L. Blucher	2102.0010000	8842

28393 7590 10/01/2002

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
SUITE 600  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3934

EXAMINER

CASTELLANO, STEPHEN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n N .

09/491,639

Applicant(s)

BLUCHER, TIMOTHY L.

Examin r

Stephen J. Castellano

Art Unit

3727

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --****Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 11, 13-19 and 28-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6, 7 and 13-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9, 11 and 28-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

Art Unit: 3727

1. Claims 6, 7 and 13-19 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention and specie, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 5 and 8.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 41 states that the nylon resin comprises polyester. Nylon is different from polyester. If the invention includes nylon and polyester then there would be a nylon-polyester blend resin.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 9 and 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binks in view of Kugler.

Binks discloses the invention except for the contoured bottom edge configuration. Kugler teaches a liner having a contoured bottom edge with a flat bottom edge which is joined to two straight tapered edges having a predetermined angle with respect to the bottom edge of

Art Unit: 3727

between 40 and 55 degrees. It would have been obvious to modify the shape of the Binks liner to have the flat bottom edge and two straight tapered edges in order to provide a contoured liner which is quick and easy to manufacture from a length of tubular sheet material while maintaining uniformity in shape.

Claims 11, 28, 29, 39, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binks in view of Kugler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the M & Q Plastic Products Brochure (the M & Q brochure).

The combination discloses the invention except for the polyamide or polyester material with a 13,000 p.s.i. tensile strength and which is non-blocking. The M & Q brochure teaches a high temperature nylon (polyamide) resin material for bags used in food applications which can withstand temperatures of 400 degrees F, has 13,000 p.s.i. tensile strength and is non-blocking. It would have been obvious to replace the liner of Ibsch or Ferlanti with the high temperature nylon resin liner in order to save material cost and manufacturing cost related to forming a contoured liner. For claim 41, it would have been obvious to modify the nylon to be a nylon-polyester blend in order to add strength to the nylon resin in order to resist puncture and breaking of the liner.

Claims 1-5, 9, 11 and 28-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibsch or Ferlanti in view of Kugler and the M & Q Plastic Products Brochure (the M & Q brochure).

Ibsch discloses a pan liner system comprising a pan (10) with a bottom panel and a sidewall extending upwardly from the bottom panel and a pan liner (the bottom layer of the plurality of laminations 14) having a contoured fit disposed within the pan to cover an interior

Art Unit: 3727

surface of the pan, the pan liner including a contoured bottom edge (the circular edge that circumscribes the flat bottom), a flexible sidewall extending upwardly from the bottom end (16), an open top end extending upwardly beyond the top edge of the pan's sidewall and being folded over the pan's top edge (17, 18), the pan liner not having dog ears.

Ferlanti discloses a pan liner system comprising a pan (12) with a bottom panel and a sidewall extending upwardly from the bottom panel and a pan liner (10) (the bottom layer of the plurality of laminations) having a contoured fit disposed within the pan to cover an interior surface of the pan, the pan liner including a contoured bottom edge, a flexible sidewall extending upwardly from the bottom end, an open top end extending upwardly beyond the top edge of the pan's sidewall and being folded over the pan's top edge, the pan liner not having dog ears. The pan liner (10) is made from a material comprising plastic and is made of metal with a polytetrafluoroethylene (TEFLON) film (see col. 3, lines 26-33). Regardless of the unsuitability of some plastics as mentioned in column 1, it seems that Ferlanti is rather clear that plastic is quite suitable. Polytetrafluoroethylene is neither fragile or likely to ignite.

Ibsch and Ferlanti disclose the invention except for the configuration of the contoured bottom edge, the liner isn't a single drop-in type and the liner material isn't high temperature plastic material, with a 13,000 p.s.i. tensile strength which is non-blocking.

Kugler teaches a single drop-in type liner having a contoured bottom edge with a flat bottom edge which is joined to two straight tapered edges having a predetermined angle with respect to the bottom edge of between 40 and 55 degrees. It would have been obvious to modify the shape of the Ibsch and Ferlanti liners to have the flat bottom edge and two straight tapered edges in order to provide a contoured liner which is quick and easy to manufacture from a length

Art Unit: 3727

of tubular sheet material while maintaining uniformity in shape. It would have been obvious to modify the liner to be a single, drop-in type in order to provide the quick and reduced manipulation assembly which eliminates the step of tucking the free edge of the open mouth of the liner beneath the upper edge.

The M & Q brochure teaches a high temperature nylon resin material for bags used in food applications which can withstand temperatures of 400 degrees F, has 13,000 p.s.i. tensile strength and is non-blocking. It would have been obvious to replace the liner of Ibsch or Ferlanti with the high temperature nylon resin liner in order to save material cost and manufacturing cost related to forming a contoured liner. For claim 41, it would have been obvious to modify the nylon to be a nylon-polyester blend in order to add strength to the nylon resin in order to resist puncture and breaking of the liner.

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed August 30, 2002 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1, 32, 34 and 36 based upon the rejection of claims 1-5, 9 and 30-37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binks in view of Kugler, the rejection of claims 11, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binks in view of Kugler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the M & Q Plastics Products Brochure, and the rejection of claims 1-5, 9, 11 and 28-37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ibsch or Ferlanti in view of Kugler and the M & Q Brochure as set forth in the last Office action because: The declaration fails to set forth facts and the showing is not commensurate in scope with the claims.

The declaration lacks evidence of criticality or unexpected results, commercial success, long-felt but unresolved needs, failure of others, skepticism of experts or any other evidentiary

Art Unit: 3727

showing. The declaration generally sets forth the opinion of Mr. Michael Handley of Arlington, Texas that the invention would not have been obvious. Mr. Handley is employed by M & Q Plastic Products, the assignee of this application. M & Q Plastic Products and Mr. Handley would benefit from an allowed application and the subsequent patent.

The declaration substantively discusses the merits of the claims in paragraph No. 8 and refers to claims 1, 32, 34 and 36 in the first sentence. Subparagraph 8B discusses Binks, subparagraph 8C discusses Kugler, subparagraph 8D discusses Ibsch, Jr. and Ferlanti and subparagraph 8E discusses the product brochure. Each of subparagraphs 8B, 8C, 8D and 8E individually discusses the references and what each reference lacks with respect to the claimed invention. This implies that each reference doesn't by itself anticipate the invention. A fact already assumed since no anticipatory rejection is currently of record. There is only discussion in general terms that the references can not be combined. There is no detailed discussion of even one 103 rejection where the motivational statement is considered and the motivation is rebutted with reasoned argument.


The declaration substantively discusses the problem which applicant seeks to solve in subparagraph 8A. The problem is defined as: The trapping of food in the pockets formed in the corners of the bag-shaped liner, the trapped food causes waste. Ibsch, Jr. and Ferlanti solve the problem. These reference disclose the combination of a pan and liner, the liner having a preformed bag-shaped liner with no pockets formed in corners of the bag.

In view of the foregoing, when all of the evidence is considered, the totality of the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness fails to outweigh the evidence of obviousness.

Art Unit: 3727

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9302. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into group 3720 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Castellano whose telephone number is (703)-308-1035.

  
Stephen Castellano  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3727

September 25, 2002